

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 and 19 have been canceled. Claims 12, 13, 18, 20, 23, 25-31 and 34 have been amended. Claims 38-47 are new. No new matter has been added.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1,2,4-20, 22-31 and 33-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on U.S. Patent Application Publication no. 2004/0030781 of Etesse et al. ("Etesse") in view of U.S. Patent no. 6,345,288 of Reed et al. ("Reed"). Claims 3, 21 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Etesse in view of "QuickClick".

The present invention relates to a technique that enables a user to access related operations for a data element in a web page, without requiring the related operations to be manually determined and coded in advance. For example, new claim 38 recites:

38. (New) A method of processing a web page comprising:
 automatically classifying a data element in the web page as being of a known data type;
 automatically determining a related operation that can be performed in relation to the data element, based on the data type of which the data element has been classified; and
 causing the related operation to be indicated to a user when the user accesses the web page, to enable the user to invoke the related operation.

The cited references do not disclose or suggest such a method, either individually or in combination. Although Applicants arguments shall be directed

to the alleged combination of references, it is useful to first consider their individual disclosures, in order to ascertain what combination, if any, could be made from them.

The Examiner admits that Etesse does not disclose “as one or more of the data types”. However, the Examiner contends that Reed disclose such a feature.

Etesse discloses an Internet-based education support system, including a web interface by which a user (e.g., a student) can view and manage various types of user data and course data over the Internet. The Examiner particularly cites Etesse at Fig. 7 and paragraphs 147, 149 and 150. Etesse discloses a home page 500, which includes a Courses tab 502 by which the user can be linked to a Course page 600 (Fig. 6). The Course page 600 lists various courses in which the student is or can be enrolled. A separate browser window 900 allows the student to view the entire course outline for a selected course.

However, Etesse fails to disclose several elements of claim 38. For example, Etesse fails to disclose or suggest automatically classifying a data element in the web page as being of a known data type. The Examiner cites Etesse at paragraph 147 as disclosing this feature, i.e., “course listed accorded to category” according to the Examiner (Final Office Action, p. 2). However, with the system of Etesse, it must be assumed that all of the course listings and other web page data are classified manually (e.g., by the web page developer) in advance, according to the traditional way of authoring a web page. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Etesse of automatically classifying any web page data.

Likewise, Reed also fails to disclose or suggest such a feature.

In addition, Etesse fails to disclose or suggest automatically determining a related operation that can be performed in relation to a data element on a web page, based on the data type of which the data element has been classified. The Examiner notes item 900 in Etesse and states that in Etesse, “course content – lists everything related to a course”. However, it must be assumed that in Etesse, the link between a listed course and the corresponding course content window 900 (i.e., the “related operation”) is determined and coded manually by the developer of the web page in advance, using the traditional method of coding such a link. Etesse does not disclose or suggest that this functional link (or a “related operation”) is determined automatically, and certainly not based on the data type of the data element. Note that the need to predetermine and manually code related operations for a web page element (as required by Etesse) is one of the disadvantages of the prior art that the present invention was designed to overcome (see “Background” section of Applicants’ specification, e.g., at p. 2, line 18 to p. 3, line 1; p. 3, lines 18-19; p. 4 line 7 to p. 5 line 6).

Likewise, Reed also fails to disclose or suggest automatically determining a related operation that can be performed in relation to a data element on a web page, based on the data type of which the data element has been classified.

For at least the above reasons, therefore, no combination of Etesse and/or Reed discloses or suggests all of the limitations of claim 38. Therefore, claim 38 and all claims which depend on it are not obvious or anticipated based on Etesse and/or Reed.

All of the other pending independent claims include limitations similar to those discussed above and, therefore, are also not obvious based on the cited art.

Dependent Claims

In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.


Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: August 17, 2005



Jordan M. Becker
Reg. No. 39,602

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300